

# Table of Contents

## 2014 Commission Summary

## 2014 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator

### Residential Reports

- Residential Assessment Actions
- Residential Assessment Survey
- Residential Correlation

### Commercial Reports

- Commercial Assessment Actions
- Commercial Assessment Survey
- Commercial Correlation

### Agricultural and/or Special Valuation Reports

- Agricultural Assessment Actions
- Agricultural Assessment Survey
- Agricultural Average Acre Values Table
- Agricultural Correlation
- Special Valuation Methodology, if applicable

### Statistical Reports

- Residential Statistics
- Commercial Statistics
- Agricultural Land Statistics
- Special Valuation Statistics, if applicable

### County Reports

- County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
- County Agricultural Land Detail
- County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property Compared with the Prior Year Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL).
- County Assessor's Three Year Plan of Assessment
- Assessment Survey – General Information

### Certification

### Maps

- Market Areas

### Valuation History Charts



## 2014 Commission Summary for Grant County

### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	9	Median	130.43
Total Sales Price	\$290,500	Mean	147.55
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$290,500	Wgt. Mean	120.44
Total Assessed Value	\$349,887	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$25,931
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$32,278	Avg. Assessed Value	\$38,876

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	103.34 to 214.44
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	88.15 to 152.73
95% Mean C.I	109.60 to 185.50
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	5.49
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	2.83
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	4.24

### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2013	11		130.43
2012	9		123.37
2011	7	0	123
2010	7	100	94

## 2014 Commission Summary for Grant County

### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	5	Median	109.75
Total Sales Price	\$347,500	Mean	107.48
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$347,500	Wgt. Mean	107.24
Total Assessed Value	\$372,672	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$24,177
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$69,500	Avg. Assessed Value	\$74,534

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	N/A
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	N/A
95% Mean C.I	89.57 to 125.39
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	1.21
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	6.67
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	20.55

### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2013	7		114.50
2012	6		110.28
2011	1	0	98
2010	1	100	98



## 2014 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Grant County

My opinions and recommendations are stated as a conclusion based on all of the factors known to me regarding the assessment practices and statistical analysis for this county. See, Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-5027 (2011). While the median assessment sales ratio from the Qualified Statistical Reports for each class of real property is considered, my opinion of the level of value for a class of real property may be determined from other evidence contained within these Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator. My opinion of quality of assessment for a class of real property may be influenced by the assessment practices of the county assessor.

Class	Level of Value	Quality of Assessment	Non-binding recommendation
<b>Residential Real Property</b>	<b>100</b>	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Commercial Real Property</b>	<b>100</b>	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Agricultural Land</b>	<b>69</b>	Does not meet generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	Irrigated; +21%

*\*\*A level of value displayed as NEI (not enough information) represents a class of property with insufficient information to determine a level of value.*

Dated this 7th day of April, 2014.



\_\_\_\_\_  
Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator



## **2014 Residential Assessment Actions for Grant County**

There were no major changes within the commercial class of real property for 2014; only the routine maintenance was completed.

A residential reappraisal was completed in 2012 and placed on the assessment rolls in 2013.

## 2014 Residential Assessment Survey for Grant County

<b>1.</b>	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>										
	Contracted appraiser and assessor.										
<b>2.</b>	<b>List the valuation groupings recognized by the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:</b>										
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 20%;"><u>Valuation Grouping</u></th> <th><u>Description of unique characteristics</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td>Includes all Hyannis, villages, and rural residential</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	1	Includes all Hyannis, villages, and rural residential				
<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>										
1	Includes all Hyannis, villages, and rural residential										
<b>3.</b>	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.</b>										
	Primarily the cost approach and utilizing sales to establish depreciation. The sales comparison approach is not used since there are so few sales.										
<b>4.</b>	<b>If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?</b>										
	Depreciation is based on the market.										
<b>5.</b>	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>										
	Not applicable.										
<b>6.</b>	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?</b>										
	Valued by square foot method.										
<b>7.</b>	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 25%;"><u>Valuation Grouping</u></th> <th style="width: 25%;"><u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u></th> <th style="width: 25%;"><u>Date of Costing</u></th> <th style="width: 25%;"><u>Date of Lot Value Study</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2012</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2012</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2011</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u>	<u>Date of Costing</u>	<u>Date of Lot Value Study</u>	1	2012	2012	2011
<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u>	<u>Date of Costing</u>	<u>Date of Lot Value Study</u>								
1	2012	2012	2011								
	Lot values were reviewed in 2011 buy were not changed.										

# **2014 Residential Correlation Section for Grant County**

---

## **County Overview**

Grant County is essentially ranch land with a total county population of approximately 629 people (2012 census). Historically the 1890 census indicated 426 residents, over the ensuing years there was a slow increase, the passage of the Kinkaid Act in 1904 proved to be a boom for Grant County and by 1920 the population reached 1486. But because the land was not conducive to farming and with the depression of the 1930's many people left. Those that remained bought up the land and many large ranches were established.

There are three towns in Grant County; Ashby (unincorporated), Whitman (unincorporated) and Hyannis. In the beginning, for a short period of time, Whitman was considered the county seat before it was re-located to Hyannis. Hyannis is most likely considered a minimum convenience center for employment and retail goods and services considering its distance from larger more populated areas. The residential market here seems to be flat to somewhat declining with a longer marketing time and fewer buyers.

## **Description of Analysis**

Few residential sales ever occur during any two year study period; this reduces the reliability of any statistical analysis. The statistical sampling of 9 sales is not sufficient to have reliability in the measurement of the residential class.

Lore Appraisal Company assisted the County in completing the first six-year physical inspection and review cycle and reappraising the residential class.

## **Sales Qualification**

Grant County has a consistent procedure that is utilized for residential sales verification. A department review of the non-qualified sales demonstrates a sufficient explanation in the County notes section to substantiate the reason for the exclusion from the qualified sales sample. There is no evidence of excessive trimming in the file.

## **Equalization and Quality of Assessment**

The Department utilizes a yearly analysis of one-third of the counties within the state to systematically review assessment practices. Grant County was selected for review in 2013. With the information available it was confirmed that the assessment practices are reliable and applied consistently. It is believed the residential properties are being treated in a uniform and proportionate manner.

The sales file consists of only 9 qualified residential sales and is considerate to be inadequate for statistical measurement and unrepresentative of the residential class as a whole.

## **2014 Residential Correlation Section for Grant County**

---

### **Level of Value**

Based on the consideration of all available information and assessment practices, the level of value is determined to be at the statutory level of 100% of market value for the residential class of property.



## **2014 Commercial Assessment Actions for Grant County**

There were no major changes within the commercial class of real property for assessment year 2014. The annual maintenance was completed.

A commercial reappraisal was completed in Grant County in December of 2011 and placed on the tax rolls in 2012.

## 2014 Commercial Assessment Survey for Grant County

<b>1.</b>	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>		
	Contracted appraiser.		
<b>2.</b>	<b>List the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:</b>		
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	
	1	All commercial in the county.	
<b>3.</b>	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.</b>		
	Primarily the cost approach, there are few commercial sales in Grant County to utilize the sales comparison approach or enough income and expense information to make the income approach meaningful.		
<b>3a.</b>	<b>Describe the process used to determine the value of unique commercial properties.</b>		
	Would work with a contracted appraiser.		
<b>4.</b>	<b>If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?</b>		
	Due to limited sales, the depreciation tables used are a blend of local market and TerraScan tables. When there is a sale that can be used, an RCN is developed for the sale. By subtracting the land value from the sale price a bldg residual is calculated and divided by the RCN to determine remaining value or remaining life of bldg. This percentage good is then compared with TerraScan and adjusted accordingly.		
<b>5.</b>	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>		
	Not applicable.		
<b>6.</b>	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.</b>		
	Square foot method.		
<b>7.</b>	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u>	<u>Date of Costing</u>
	1	2011	2011
			<u>Date of Lot Value Study</u>
			2011

## **2014 Commercial Correlation Section for Grant County**

---

### **County Overview**

Hyannis is a small town of approximately 182 people and the other two villages (Ashby and Whitman) have considerably smaller populations. All of the towns were built along the railroad line for providing services and the shipment of cattle. The communities of Grant County serve the basic needs of the area ranchers. Hyannis may be considered as a minimum convenience center for employment and retail goods and services considering its distance from larger more populated areas. The historical hotel built in 1898 (Hotel DeFair as listed on the National Register of Historical Places) is on the market; currently it is being leased in hopes of keeping it open. These influences will affect the commercial economy in Grant County but, an active commercial market does not exist.

### **Description of Analysis**

The commercial properties comprise 36 different occupancy codes; for the most part 1 property per code. Only two occupancy codes have ten or more parcels, that being office buildings (344) and storage warehouses (406). There have been only five commercial sales during this study period.

Lore Appraisal Service assisted the County in completing the first six-year physical inspection and review cycle and reappraising the commercial properties.

### **Sales Qualification**

The Department completed a sales verification review for all counties in 2013. All non-qualified sales were reviewed to ensure that the reasons for disqualification were sufficient and documented. Measurement was done utilizing all available information and there is no evidence of excessive trimming in the file.

### **Equalization and Quality of Assessment**

The Department utilizes a yearly analysis of one-third of the counties within the state to systematically review assessment practices. Grant County was selected for review in 2013. With the information available it was confirmed that the county was actively reviewing properties as required by statute and that the assessment practices are reliable and being applied consistently. It is believed the commercial properties are being treated in a uniform and proportionate manner.

For measurement purposes the commercial sample is unreliable and does not represent the commercial class as a whole.

## **2014 Commercial Correlation Section for Grant County**

---

### **Level of Value**

Based on the consideration of all available information and assessment practices, the level of value is determined to be at the statutory level of 100% of market value for the commercial class of property.



## **2014 Agricultural Assessment Actions for Grant County**

The physical inspection and review of agricultural improvements within Grant County was completed in 2014. New pictures were taken and improvements were revalued using the Marshall & Swift June/2013 cost indexes.

Grant County changed the agricultural land values for 2014; grassland values increased from \$245 to \$260 per acre and irrigated values increased from \$1000 to \$1250 per acre.

## 2014 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Grant County

<b>1.</b>	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	Assessor and part-time clerk.				
<b>2.</b>	<b>List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.</b>	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%; text-align: center;"><u>Market Area</u></th> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>Description of unique characteristics</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td>Grant County is very homogeneous in geographic and soil characteristics; the county is approximately ninety-eight percent grassland, with a small amount of irrigated acres.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Market Area</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	0	Grant County is very homogeneous in geographic and soil characteristics; the county is approximately ninety-eight percent grassland, with a small amount of irrigated acres.
<u>Market Area</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>					
0	Grant County is very homogeneous in geographic and soil characteristics; the county is approximately ninety-eight percent grassland, with a small amount of irrigated acres.					
<b>3.</b>	<b>Describe the process used to determine and monitor market areas.</b>	Not applicable.				
<b>4.</b>	<b>Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.</b>	Rural/Farm Residential – Less than 40 acres are classified as small acreages and or small farm sites – also known as a “non-working farm”. To the average consumer the “profits gained” are not considered actual income and are to be determined by the Internal Revenue Service and/or a qualified tax expert. Recreational land has not been identified as of yet in the market.				
<b>5.</b>	<b>Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites? If not, what are the market differences?</b>	No. Location and distance from Hyannis. The home sites, known as outlots, around Hyannis are \$3000 for the first acre, and \$500 up to ten acres, over ten acres \$250 up to twenty acres. It then becomes priced as agland. Ashby and Whitman (both unincorporated) are \$1000 for the first acre then \$500 up to ten acres and \$250 up to twenty acres.				
<b>6.</b>	<b>Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.</b>	Not applicable.				
<b>7.</b>	<b>Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If a value difference is recognized describe the process used to develop the uninfluenced value.</b>	No				
<b>8.</b>	<b>If applicable, describe the process used to develop assessed values for parcels enrolled in the Wetland Reserve Program.</b>	Not applicable.				

## Grant County 2014 Average Acre Value Comparison

County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	WEIGHTED AVG IRR
Grant	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1,250	1,250	1,250	1,250
Hooker	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1,250	1,250
McPherson	1	N/A	N/A	1,475	1,475	N/A	1,475	1,475	1,475	1,475
Arthur	1	N/A	N/A	1,475	N/A	1,475	1,475	1,475	1,475	1,475
Garden	1	N/A	1,475	1,475	1,475	1,475	1,475	1,475	1,475	1,475
Sheridan	1	#DIV/0!	1,350	1,300	1,200	1,195	1,185	1,175	1,150	1,244
Cherry	1	N/A	1,650	1,650	1,649	1,491	1,477	1,494	1,500	1,527

County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	WEIGHTED AVG DRY
Grant	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hooker	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
McPherson	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	605	N/A	605	605	605	605
Arthur	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Garden	1	N/A	730	730	650	650	600	500	500	684
Sheridan	1	#DIV/0!	550	525	500	490	465	455	450	497
Cherry	1	N/A	550	525	500	500	500	500	500	506

County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	WEIGHTED AVG GRASS
Grant	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	260	260	260	260
Hooker	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	255	255	250	250	250
McPherson	1	N/A	N/A	275	275	N/A	275	275	275	275
Arthur	1	N/A	N/A	265	N/A	265	265	265	265	265
Garden	1	N/A	378	270	302	278	287	264	260	263
Sheridan	1	#DIV/0!	375	375	365	355	355	290	260	290
Cherry	1	N/A	500	475	455	425	375	250	250	274

Source: 2014 Abstract of Assessment, Form 45, Schedule IX

# 2014 Agricultural Correlation Section for Grant County

---

## County Overview

Grant County is located in the center of the Nebraska Sand Hills; the Valentine series soils are the most common in the Sand Hill region. Grant County is included in the Upper Loup Natural Resource District; there are moratoriums and restrictions but the district also authorizes new well drilling for up to 2500 acres annually. There are only a minimal amount of acres under irrigation due to the instability of the soils; in the Sand Hills these pivots are utilized to provide a supplemental feed source. The county consists of large ranches, and the economy of the area relies heavily on the grass and the production of livestock.

The Sand Hills is very homogeneous and the comparable area around the county is quite extensive. Counties immediately adjoining Grant County would be Cherry County to the north, Hooker County to the east, Arthur and McPherson (within a mile) counties to the south and Garden and Sheridan to the west and northwest. The land use makeup of Grant County is approximately 98% grass, less than 1% irrigated and no dry land.

## Description of Analysis

For 2014, county wide increases to grass amounted to 4%, and irrigated amounted to 25%. Analysis of the grass values indicates assessment levels are within the acceptable range and values are relatively similar to adjoining counties. For the subclass of irrigated land however, historical changes in assessed values do not appear to have increased parallel to general sales analysis and economic indicators.

Last year Grant County and all the Sand Hill counties increased irrigated values significantly; however, sales analysis suggests that those values are still lagging behind the market. A market analysis of all counties within the Sand Hill Region indicates that irrigated land is selling for approximately \$2,140 per acre. Assessed values in the range of \$1475-\$1600 would produce a level of value within the acceptable range. Because, better soils for crop production will be found in the northern part of Cherry and Sheridan counties and the southern parts of Logan, Lincoln, Keith and Garden counties, irrigated sales from across the sand hills were further stratified into sales containing the most pure sandy soils. This stratification reduced the size of the sample to 8 sales, but this sample is the most reliable data available with which to estimate the level of value of irrigated land in Grant County. The assessed values of the comparable sales were calculated using the Grant County values. The following statistics were calculated from this sample:

Median	59.50%	AAD	15.80%
Mean	66.29%	PRD	97.56%
W/ Mean	67.95%	COD	26.56%

## **2014 Agricultural Correlation Section for Grant County**

---

### **Sales Qualification**

The Department completed a sales verification review for all counties in 2013. All non-qualified sales were reviewed to ensure that the reasons for disqualification were sufficient and documented. Measurement was done utilizing all available information. There is no evidence of excessive trimming in the file.

### **Equalization and Quality of Assessment**

Based on a correlation of all available information, the level of value for the grass land is acceptable but the level of value for the irrigated land is not. Since the tax burden is essentially shifted to the grass sectors as a result of the assessor's failure to increase irrigated land, assessment practices are not in compliance with accepted mass appraisal standards.

### **Level of Value**

Based on a correlation of all available information, the level of value for the irrigated land is determined to be 60%. The level of value of grass land is best represented by the greater than 95% majority land use statistics, which is 69%.

### **Non-Binding Recommendation**

The recommendation of the Property Tax Administrator is to increase irrigated land 21% in Grant County to bring the irrigated subclass level of value to the midpoint of the acceptable range.

<b>County</b>	<b>Irrigated Avg Assessed</b>
Grant	1513
Cherry	1564
Thomas	1475
McPherson	1475
Arthur	1475
Hooker	1250

The resulting values expected from a 21% increase would put the assessed values within the acceptable range and the values would be reasonably similar to similar markets in adjoining counties, as indicated in the chart above. Hooker County's irrigated subclass is also below the acceptable range, and a similar adjustment has been recommended in the 2014 Reports & Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Hooker County.



**38 Grant**  
**RESIDENTIAL**

**PAD 2014 R&O Statistics (Using 2014 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2011 To 9/30/2013 Posted on: 1/1/2014

Number of Sales : 9	MEDIAN : 130	COV : 33.46	95% Median C.I. : 103.34 to 214.44
Total Sales Price : 290,500	WGT. MEAN : 120	STD : 49.37	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 88.15 to 152.73
Total Adj. Sales Price : 290,500	MEAN : 148	Avg. Abs. Dev : 38.32	95% Mean C.I. : 109.60 to 185.50
Total Assessed Value : 349,887			
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 32,278	COD : 29.38	MAX Sales Ratio : 227.71	
Avg. Assessed Value : 38,876	PRD : 122.51	MIN Sales Ratio : 95.52	

Printed:3/13/2014 4:05:24PM

<b>DATE OF SALE *</b>										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
<u>Qtrrs</u>											
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	2	138.53	138.53	141.56	05.85	97.86	130.43	146.62	N/A	24,000	33,974
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	1	182.44	182.44	182.44	00.00	100.00	182.44	182.44	N/A	17,000	31,014
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	4	112.70	137.16	106.87	33.48	128.34	95.52	227.71	N/A	49,250	52,633
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12											
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12	2	159.91	159.91	141.74	34.10	112.82	105.38	214.44	N/A	14,250	20,198
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13											
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13											
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13											
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	7	130.43	144.02	118.13	25.83	121.92	95.52	227.71	95.52 to 227.71	37,429	44,213
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	2	159.91	159.91	141.74	34.10	112.82	105.38	214.44	N/A	14,250	20,198
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-12 To 31-DEC-12	7	122.06	150.13	116.26	37.49	129.13	95.52	227.71	95.52 to 227.71	34,643	40,277
<u>ALL</u>	9	130.43	147.55	120.44	29.38	122.51	95.52	227.71	103.34 to 214.44	32,278	38,876

<b>VALUATION GROUPING</b>										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
01	9	130.43	147.55	120.44	29.38	122.51	95.52	227.71	103.34 to 214.44	32,278	38,876
<u>ALL</u>	9	130.43	147.55	120.44	29.38	122.51	95.52	227.71	103.34 to 214.44	32,278	38,876

<b>PROPERTY TYPE *</b>										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
01	8	126.25	139.19	117.27	25.83	118.69	95.52	227.71	95.52 to 227.71	35,125	41,189
06											
07	1	214.44	214.44	214.44	00.00	100.00	214.44	214.44	N/A	9,500	20,372
<u>ALL</u>	9	130.43	147.55	120.44	29.38	122.51	95.52	227.71	103.34 to 214.44	32,278	38,876

**38 Grant**  
**RESIDENTIAL**

**PAD 2014 R&O Statistics (Using 2014 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2011 To 9/30/2013 Posted on: 1/1/2014

Number of Sales : 9  
Total Sales Price : 290,500  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 290,500  
Total Assessed Value : 349,887  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 32,278  
Avg. Assessed Value : 38,876

MEDIAN : 130  
WGT. MEAN : 120  
MEAN : 148  
COD : 29.38  
PRD : 122.51

COV : 33.46  
STD : 49.37  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 38.32  
MAX Sales Ratio : 227.71  
MIN Sales Ratio : 95.52

95% Median C.I. : 103.34 to 214.44  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 88.15 to 152.73  
95% Mean C.I. : 109.60 to 185.50

Printed:3/13/2014 4:05:24PM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
___ Low \$ Ranges ___												
Less Than 5,000												
Less Than 15,000	2	221.08	221.08	221.25	03.00	99.92	214.44	227.71	N/A	9,750	21,572	
Less Than 30,000	6	156.44	163.74	151.06	28.41	108.39	105.38	227.71	105.38 to 227.71	15,917	24,043	
___ Ranges Excl. Low \$ ___												
Greater Than 4,999	9	130.43	147.55	120.44	29.38	122.51	95.52	227.71	103.34 to 214.44	32,278	38,876	
Greater Than 14,999	7	122.06	126.54	113.19	18.17	111.79	95.52	182.44	95.52 to 182.44	38,714	43,821	
Greater Than 29,999	3	103.34	115.16	105.45	16.48	109.21	95.52	146.62	N/A	65,000	68,543	
___ Incremental Ranges ___												
0 TO 4,999												
5,000 TO 14,999	2	221.08	221.08	221.25	03.00	99.92	214.44	227.71	N/A	9,750	21,572	
15,000 TO 29,999	4	126.25	135.08	133.05	16.92	101.53	105.38	182.44	N/A	19,000	25,279	
30,000 TO 59,999	2	124.98	124.98	125.31	17.31	99.74	103.34	146.62	N/A	32,500	40,727	
60,000 TO 99,999												
100,000 TO 149,999	1	95.52	95.52	95.52	00.00	100.00	95.52	95.52	N/A	130,000	124,175	
150,000 TO 249,999												
250,000 TO 499,999												
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
___ ALL ___	9	130.43	147.55	120.44	29.38	122.51	95.52	227.71	103.34 to 214.44	32,278	38,876	

**38 Grant**  
**COMMERCIAL**

**PAD 2014 R&O Statistics (Using 2014 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2010 To 9/30/2013 Posted on: 1/1/2014

Number of Sales : 5  
Total Sales Price : 347,500  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 347,500  
Total Assessed Value : 372,672  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 69,500  
Avg. Assessed Value : 74,534

MEDIAN : 110  
WGT. MEAN : 107  
MEAN : 107  
COD : 09.61  
PRD : 100.22

COV : 13.43  
STD : 14.43  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 10.55  
MAX Sales Ratio : 125.70  
MIN Sales Ratio : 87.91

95% Median C.I. : N/A  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : N/A  
95% Mean C.I. : 89.57 to 125.39

Printed:3/13/2014 4:05:24PM

**DATE OF SALE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10											
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	2	107.01	107.01	101.39	07.00	105.54	99.52	114.50	N/A	80,000	81,116
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	1	87.91	87.91	87.91	00.00	100.00	87.91	87.91	N/A	11,500	10,110
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	1	125.70	125.70	125.70	00.00	100.00	125.70	125.70	N/A	45,000	56,564
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11											
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	1	109.75	109.75	109.75	00.00	100.00	109.75	109.75	N/A	131,000	143,767
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12											
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12											
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12											
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13											
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13											
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13											
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	4	107.01	106.91	105.73	12.33	101.12	87.91	125.70	N/A	54,125	57,226
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	1	109.75	109.75	109.75	00.00	100.00	109.75	109.75	N/A	131,000	143,767
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13											
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	4	107.01	106.91	105.73	12.33	101.12	87.91	125.70	N/A	54,125	57,226
01-JAN-12 To 31-DEC-12	1	109.75	109.75	109.75	00.00	100.00	109.75	109.75	N/A	131,000	143,767
<u>ALL</u>	5	109.75	107.48	107.24	09.61	100.22	87.91	125.70	N/A	69,500	74,534

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	5	109.75	107.48	107.24	09.61	100.22	87.91	125.70	N/A	69,500	74,534
<u>ALL</u>	5	109.75	107.48	107.24	09.61	100.22	87.91	125.70	N/A	69,500	74,534

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
02											
03	5	109.75	107.48	107.24	09.61	100.22	87.91	125.70	N/A	69,500	74,534
04											
<u>ALL</u>	5	109.75	107.48	107.24	09.61	100.22	87.91	125.70	N/A	69,500	74,534

**38 Grant**  
**COMMERCIAL**

**PAD 2014 R&O Statistics (Using 2014 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2010 To 9/30/2013 Posted on: 1/1/2014

Number of Sales : 5  
Total Sales Price : 347,500  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 347,500  
Total Assessed Value : 372,672  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 69,500  
Avg. Assessed Value : 74,534

MEDIAN : 110  
WGT. MEAN : 107  
MEAN : 107  
COD : 09.61  
PRD : 100.22

COV : 13.43  
STD : 14.43  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 10.55  
MAX Sales Ratio : 125.70  
MIN Sales Ratio : 87.91

95% Median C.I. : N/A  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : N/A  
95% Mean C.I. : 89.57 to 125.39

Printed:3/13/2014 4:05:24PM

SALE PRICE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
<u>Low \$ Ranges</u>											
Less Than 5,000											
Less Than 15,000	1	87.91	87.91	87.91	00.00	100.00	87.91	87.91	N/A	11,500	10,110
Less Than 30,000	2	101.21	101.21	104.79	13.14	96.58	87.91	114.50	N/A	15,750	16,505
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>											
Greater Than 4,999	5	109.75	107.48	107.24	09.61	100.22	87.91	125.70	N/A	69,500	74,534
Greater Than 14,999	4	112.13	112.37	107.91	06.89	104.13	99.52	125.70	N/A	84,000	90,641
Greater Than 29,999	3	109.75	111.66	107.49	07.95	103.88	99.52	125.70	N/A	105,333	113,221
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>											
0 TO 4,999											
5,000 TO 14,999	1	87.91	87.91	87.91	00.00	100.00	87.91	87.91	N/A	11,500	10,110
15,000 TO 29,999	1	114.50	114.50	114.50	00.00	100.00	114.50	114.50	N/A	20,000	22,899
30,000 TO 59,999	1	125.70	125.70	125.70	00.00	100.00	125.70	125.70	N/A	45,000	56,564
60,000 TO 99,999											
100,000 TO 149,999	2	104.64	104.64	104.46	04.89	100.17	99.52	109.75	N/A	135,500	141,550
150,000 TO 249,999											
250,000 TO 499,999											
500,000 TO 999,999											
1,000,000 +											
<u>ALL</u>	5	109.75	107.48	107.24	09.61	100.22	87.91	125.70	N/A	69,500	74,534

OCCUPANCY CODE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
381	1	125.70	125.70	125.70	00.00	100.00	125.70	125.70	N/A	45,000	56,564
390	1	114.50	114.50	114.50	00.00	100.00	114.50	114.50	N/A	20,000	22,899
528	1	87.91	87.91	87.91	00.00	100.00	87.91	87.91	N/A	11,500	10,110
531	1	99.52	99.52	99.52	00.00	100.00	99.52	99.52	N/A	140,000	139,332
594	1	109.75	109.75	109.75	00.00	100.00	109.75	109.75	N/A	131,000	143,767
<u>ALL</u>	5	109.75	107.48	107.24	09.61	100.22	87.91	125.70	N/A	69,500	74,534

**38 Grant**  
**AGRICULTURAL LAND**

**PAD 2014 R&O Statistics (Using 2014 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2010 To 9/30/2013 Posted on: 1/1/2014

Number of Sales : 29  
Total Sales Price : 24,466,439  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 24,464,939  
Total Assessed Value : 15,153,405  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 843,619  
Avg. Assessed Value : 522,531

MEDIAN : 69  
WGT. MEAN : 62  
MEAN : 66  
COD : 14.81  
PRD : 105.96

COV : 20.69  
STD : 13.58  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 10.27  
MAX Sales Ratio : 95.90  
MIN Sales Ratio : 32.36

95% Median C.I. : 57.78 to 71.23  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 57.45 to 66.42  
95% Mean C.I. : 60.47 to 70.79

Printed:3/13/2014 4:05:25PM

<b>DATE OF SALE *</b>											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.			
<u>Qtrts</u>												
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	7	71.35	67.85	67.26	09.80	100.88	49.75	81.93	49.75 to 81.93	687,386	462,350	
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	1	69.33	69.33	69.33	00.00	100.00	69.33	69.33	N/A	367,500	254,800	
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	1	74.29	74.29	74.29	00.00	100.00	74.29	74.29	N/A	210,000	156,000	
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11												
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	4	72.01	75.06	62.18	19.75	120.71	60.31	95.90	N/A	1,669,957	1,038,332	
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	5	64.97	59.04	60.48	15.38	97.62	32.36	70.14	N/A	567,737	343,393	
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	5	66.63	66.27	59.71	18.58	110.99	47.78	92.97	N/A	809,575	483,377	
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12												
01-OCT-12 To 31-DEC-12	2	57.82	57.82	58.15	03.77	99.43	55.64	60.00	N/A	2,214,365	1,287,717	
01-JAN-13 To 31-MAR-13	2	70.39	70.39	70.39	01.19	100.00	69.55	71.23	N/A	232,450	163,613	
01-APR-13 To 30-JUN-13												
01-JUL-13 To 30-SEP-13	2	50.72	50.72	51.37	02.11	98.73	49.65	51.79	N/A	307,860	158,159	
<u>Study Yrs</u>												
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	9	71.35	68.73	67.68	08.40	101.55	49.75	81.93	56.36 to 74.29	598,800	405,250	
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	14	65.80	66.20	61.09	18.50	108.36	32.36	95.90	53.64 to 82.66	969,028	591,942	
01-OCT-12 To 30-SEP-13	6	57.82	59.64	58.43	12.59	102.07	49.65	71.23	49.65 to 71.23	918,225	536,496	
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>												
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	6	71.81	73.98	62.89	14.36	117.63	60.31	95.90	60.31 to 95.90	1,209,555	760,688	
01-JAN-12 To 31-DEC-12	12	62.49	61.85	59.29	17.04	104.32	32.36	92.97	53.64 to 70.14	942,941	559,107	
<u>ALL</u>	29	69.33	65.63	61.94	14.81	105.96	32.36	95.90	57.78 to 71.23	843,619	522,531	

<b>AREA (MARKET)</b>											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.			
Blank	29	69.33	65.63	61.94	14.81	105.96	32.36	95.90	57.78 to 71.23	843,619	522,531	
<u>ALL</u>	29	69.33	65.63	61.94	14.81	105.96	32.36	95.90	57.78 to 71.23	843,619	522,531	

<b>95%MLU By Market Area</b>											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.			
<u>Grass</u>												
County	26	69.44	65.06	62.23	14.07	104.55	32.36	95.90	57.78 to 71.23	877,760	546,252	
Blank	26	69.44	65.06	62.23	14.07	104.55	32.36	95.90	57.78 to 71.23	877,760	546,252	
<u>ALL</u>	29	69.33	65.63	61.94	14.81	105.96	32.36	95.90	57.78 to 71.23	843,619	522,531	

**38 Grant**  
**AGRICULTURAL LAND**

**PAD 2014 R&O Statistics (Using 2014 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2010 To 9/30/2013 Posted on: 1/1/2014

Number of Sales : 29  
 Total Sales Price : 24,466,439  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 24,464,939  
 Total Assessed Value : 15,153,405  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 843,619  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 522,531

MEDIAN : 69  
 WGT. MEAN : 62  
 MEAN : 66  
 COD : 14.81  
 PRD : 105.96

COV : 20.69  
 STD : 13.58  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 10.27  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 95.90  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 32.36

95% Median C.I. : 57.78 to 71.23  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 57.45 to 66.42  
 95% Mean C.I. : 60.47 to 70.79

*Printed:3/13/2014 4:05:25PM*

**80%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
____ Grass ____											
County	29	69.33	65.63	61.94	14.81	105.96	32.36	95.90	57.78 to 71.23	843,619	522,531
Blank	29	69.33	65.63	61.94	14.81	105.96	32.36	95.90	57.78 to 71.23	843,619	522,531
____ ALL ____	29	69.33	65.63	61.94	14.81	105.96	32.36	95.90	57.78 to 71.23	843,619	522,531



## 2014 Analysis of Agricultural Land

[Grant County What-if - 21% increase to irrigated only]

### Ratio Study

---

#### Final Statistics

County # sales	8	Median	71.99%	AAD	19.12%
		Mean	80.21%	COD	26.56%
		Wt Mean	82.22%	PRD	97.56%

#### Confidence Intervals

95% Median C.I.: 52.43% to 141.25%  
 95% Mean C.I.: 55.81% to 104.62%  
 95% Wt Mean C.I.: 60.60% to 103.84%



**Total Real Property**  
Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30

**Records : 1,695**

**Value : 150,135,773**

**Growth 801,283**

Sum Lines 17, 25, & 41

**Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records**

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
<b>01. Res UnImp Land</b>	29	69,781	8	19,043	46	75,872	83	164,696	
<b>02. Res Improve Land</b>	133	211,937	14	70,622	78	120,375	225	402,934	
<b>03. Res Improvements</b>	141	4,020,057	14	1,283,889	80	2,374,631	235	7,678,577	
<b>04. Res Total</b>	170	4,301,775	22	1,373,554	126	2,570,878	318	8,246,207	66,108
<b>% of Res Total</b>	53.46	52.17	6.92	16.66	39.62	31.18	18.76	5.49	8.25
<b>05. Com UnImp Land</b>	4	9,903	1	3,350	9	9,396	14	22,649	
<b>06. Com Improve Land</b>	27	25,665	7	35,651	22	22,305	56	83,621	
<b>07. Com Improvements</b>	27	1,086,973	7	272,334	27	347,688	61	1,706,995	
<b>08. Com Total</b>	31	1,122,541	8	311,335	36	379,389	75	1,813,265	0
<b>% of Com Total</b>	41.33	61.91	10.67	17.17	48.00	20.92	4.42	1.21	0.00
<b>09. Ind UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>10. Ind Improve Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>11. Ind Improvements</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>12. Ind Total</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>% of Ind Total</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>13. Rec UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>14. Rec Improve Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>15. Rec Improvements</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>16. Rec Total</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>% of Rec Total</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	170	4,301,775	22	1,373,554	126	2,570,878	318	8,246,207	66,108
<b>% of Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	53.46	52.17	6.92	16.66	39.62	31.18	18.76	5.49	8.25
<b>Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	31	1,122,541	8	311,335	36	379,389	75	1,813,265	0
<b>% of Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	41.33	61.91	10.67	17.17	48.00	20.92	4.42	1.21	0.00
<b>17. Taxable Total</b>	201	5,424,316	30	1,684,889	162	2,950,267	393	10,059,472	66,108
<b>% of Taxable Total</b>	51.15	53.92	7.63	16.75	41.22	29.33	23.19	6.70	8.25

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. Commercial	0	0	0	0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. Commercial	0	0	0	0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				0	0	0

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

Mineral Interest	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value	Growth
23. Producing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
24. Non-Producing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
25. Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	41	1	86	128

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	1	7,379	1,164	114,273,952	1,165	114,281,331
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	1	10,423	130	15,740,875	131	15,751,298
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	1	38,639	136	10,005,033	137	10,043,672
30. Ag Total							1,302	140,076,301

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	1	1.00	130	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	1	0.00	38,639	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	2.00	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	Growth
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	101	163.00	326,000	101	163.00	326,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	104	158.00	7,740,204	104	158.00	7,740,204	735,175
34. HomeSite Total				<b>104</b>	<b>163.00</b>	<b>8,066,204</b>	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	2	3.00	390	2	3.00	390	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	123	407.00	60,390	124	408.00	60,520	
37. FarmSite Improvements	125	0.00	2,264,829	126	0.00	2,303,468	0
38. FarmSite Total				<b>128</b>	<b>411.00</b>	<b>2,364,378</b>	
39. Road & Ditches	0	1,285.44	0	0	1,287.44	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				<b>232</b>	<b>1,861.44</b>	<b>10,430,582</b>	<b>735,175</b>

Schedule VII : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Detail - Game & Parks

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	11	663.34	57,945	11	663.34	57,945

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
44. Recapture Value N/A	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
44. Market Value	0	0	0	0	0	0

\* LB 968 (2006) for tax year 2009 and forward there will be no Recapture value.

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
47. 2A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
48. 2A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
49. 3A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
50. 3A	799.38	29.80%	999,225	29.80%	1,250.00
51. 4A1	261.92	9.77%	327,400	9.77%	1,250.00
52. 4A	1,620.90	60.43%	2,026,125	60.43%	1,250.00
<b>53. Total</b>	<b>2,682.20</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>3,352,750</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,250.00</b>
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
56. 2D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
57. 2D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
58. 3D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
59. 3D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
60. 4D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
61. 4D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>62. Total</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0.00</b>
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
65. 2G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
66. 2G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
67. 3G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
68. 3G	22,871.23	4.71%	5,946,520	4.71%	260.00
69. 4G1	39,721.71	8.18%	10,327,646	8.18%	260.00
70. 4G	422,788.64	87.10%	109,925,050	87.10%	260.00
<b>71. Total</b>	<b>485,381.58</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>126,199,216</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>260.00</b>
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
<b>Irrigated Total</b>	<b>2,682.20</b>	<b>0.54%</b>	<b>3,352,750</b>	<b>2.59%</b>	<b>1,250.00</b>
<b>Dry Total</b>					
<b>Dry Total</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0.00</b>
<b>Grass Total</b>					
<b>Grass Total</b>	<b>485,381.58</b>	<b>97.58%</b>	<b>126,199,216</b>	<b>97.34%</b>	<b>260.00</b>
72. Waste	9,375.39	1.88%	93,753	0.07%	10.00
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	950.43	0.19%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>75. Market Area Total</b>	<b>497,439.17</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>129,645,719</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>260.63</b>

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
<b>76. Irrigated</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	2,682.20	3,352,750	2,682.20	3,352,750
<b>77. Dry Land</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
<b>78. Grass</b>	0.00	0	67.95	17,667	485,313.63	126,181,549	485,381.58	126,199,216
<b>79. Waste</b>	0.00	0	0.50	5	9,374.89	93,748	9,375.39	93,753
<b>80. Other</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
<b>81. Exempt</b>	380.16	0	0.00	0	570.27	0	950.43	0
<b>82. Total</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>68.45</b>	<b>17,672</b>	<b>497,370.72</b>	<b>129,628,047</b>	<b>497,439.17</b>	<b>129,645,719</b>

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
<b>Irrigated</b>	2,682.20	0.54%	3,352,750	2.59%	1,250.00
<b>Dry Land</b>	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Grass</b>	485,381.58	97.58%	126,199,216	97.34%	260.00
<b>Waste</b>	9,375.39	1.88%	93,753	0.07%	10.00
<b>Other</b>	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Exempt</b>	950.43	0.19%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>497,439.17</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>129,645,719</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>260.63</b>

## 2014 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 Compared with the 2013 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL)

38 Grant

	2013 CTL County Total	2014 Form 45 County Total	Value Difference (2014 form 45 - 2013 CTL)	Percent Change	2014 Growth (New Construction Value)	Percent Change excl. Growth
01. Residential	8,031,517	8,246,207	214,690	2.67%	66,108	1.85%
02. Recreational	0	0	0		0	
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	6,614,035	8,066,204	1,452,169	21.96%	735,175	10.84%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>14,645,552</b>	<b>16,312,411</b>	<b>1,666,859</b>	<b>11.38%</b>	<b>801,283</b>	<b>5.91%</b>
05. Commercial	1,813,265	1,813,265	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
06. Industrial	0	0	0		0	
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	2,250,651	2,364,378	113,727	5.05%	0	5.05%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
<b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>4,063,916</b>	<b>4,177,643</b>	<b>113,727</b>	<b>2.80%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2.80%</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>18,709,468</b>	<b>20,490,054</b>	<b>1,780,586</b>	<b>9.52%</b>	<b>801,283</b>	<b>5.23%</b>
11. Irrigated	2,093,090	3,352,750	1,259,660	60.18%		
12. Dryland	0	0	0			
13. Grassland	119,100,516	126,199,216	7,098,700	5.96%		
14. Wasteland	93,149	93,753	604	0.65%		
15. Other Agland	1,220	0	-1,220	-100.00%		
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>121,287,975</b>	<b>129,645,719</b>	<b>8,357,744</b>	<b>6.89%</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>139,997,443</b>	<b>150,135,773</b>	<b>10,138,330</b>	<b>7.24%</b>	<b>801,283</b>	<b>6.67%</b>

**GRANT COUNTY**  
**PLAN OF ASSESSMENT**

**PLAN OF ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS:**

Pursuant to Neb. Laws 2005, LB 263, Section 9, on or before June 15<sup>th</sup> of each year, the assessor shall prepare a plan of assessment which describes the assessment actions planned for the next assessment year and two years thereafter. The plan shall indicate the classes or subclasses of real property that the county assessor plans to examine during the years contained in the plan of assessment. The plan shall describe all the assessment actions necessary to achieve the levels of value and quality of assessment practices required by law, and the resources necessary to complete those actions. On or before July 31<sup>st</sup> of each year, the assessor shall present the plan to the county board of equalization and the assessor may amend the plan, if necessary, after the budget is approved by the county board. A copy of the plan and any amendments thereto shall be mailed to the Property Assessment Division of the Department of Revenue on or before October 31<sup>st</sup> of each year.

**REAL PROPERTY ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS:**

All property in the State of Nebraska is subject to property tax unless expressly exempt by Nebraska Constitution or is permitted by the constitution and enabling legislation adopted by the legislature. The uniform standard for the assessed value of real property for tax purposes is actual value, which is defined by law as “the market value of real property in the ordinary course of trade.”

Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-112 (Reissue 2003)

Assessment levels required for real property are as follows:

1. One hundred (100) percent of actual value for all classes of real property excluding agricultural and horticultural land;
2. Seventy-five (75) percent of actual value for agricultural land and horticultural land; and
3. Seventy-five (75) percent of special value as defined in §77-1343 and at its actual value when the land is disqualified for special valuation under §77-1347 for agricultural land and horticultural land which meets the qualifications for special valuation under §77-1344.

Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-201 (R.S. Supp. 2006)

## GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF REAL PROPERTY IN GRANT COUNTY:

Per the 2013 County Abstract, Grant County consists of the following real property types:

	Parcel/Acre Count		Total Value		Land Value	Improvement Value
Residential	318		8,055,561		563,860	7,491,701
Commercial	75		1,813,418		106,270	1,707,148
Agricultural	1301		130,189,372		121,704,143	8,485,229
Game & Parks	11		51,782		51,782	0
Exempt	128		0		0	0
Total	1833		140,110,133		122,426,055	17,684,078

Agricultural land is the predominant property type in Grant County, with the majority consisting of grassland, primarily used for cow/calf operations.

Additional information is contained in the 2013 Reports & Opinions, issued by the Property Assessment Division of the Department of Revenue, April 2013.

## CURRENT RESOURCES:

### Staff/Budget/Training

The assessor and 1 part-time employee are the only employees in the office. The county hires an independent appraiser, as needed, for appraisal maintenance.

The proposed budget for the assessment portion of the Assessor's budget for FY 2013-2014 is \$24,450.00

I was elected to the office as Clerk Ex Officio in the General Election in November 2010. I plan on attending as many workshops and district meetings as the current budget will allow. I believe that knowledge is the key to maintaining this position.

### Record Maintenance

In December of 2009 I, Christee Haney, appeared before the Nebraska State Records Board because I applied for a Grant to help defer the cost of a new mapping system for Grant County. I was awarded the grant and just recently the files were installed on our computer. I think this GIS software is going to be a very helpful tool for Grant County.

New property record cards were created for improved parcels of real property in 1999. Each property record card is filed by current owner alphabetically. If the owner has more than one parcel they are all filed in one folder. I hope to change that so that the property record cards are filed by Township, Range and then by Section.

Grant County is using the TerraScan software. The GIS system is complete. Grant County is not currently set up to view these records online but that is one of my goals as Clerk/Assessor.

## **ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES:**

### Discover/List/Inventory Property

The assessor is also Register of Deeds which is helpful in the discovery process. Data collection will be done on a regular basis to ensure listings are current and accurate. Utilization of the local FSA, NRCS, and NRD offices are also useful in tracking land usage.

### Data Collection

Grant County will implement procedures to complete a physical routine inspection of all properties on a six-year cycle.

### Ratio Studies

Ratio studies are a vital tool in considering any assessment actions taken. Ratio studies are conducted internally to determine whether any assessment action is required in a specific area or class of property. Consultation with the field liaison is an important part of this process.

### Value Approaches

**Market Approach:** The market approach is used on all classes of property to obtain market value for each parcel of property. Sales comparison is the most common way to determine market value on similar properties.

**Cost Approach:** The cost approach is primarily used in the valuation process of residential and commercial properties. A depreciation factor derived from market analysis within the county is used to apply to the RCN to determine market value.

**Income Approach:** The income approach is primarily used in the valuation of commercial properties.

Land valuation studies will be performed on an annual basis. A three-year study of arms-length transactions will be used to obtain current market values.

### Reconciliation of Value

A reconciliation of the three approaches to value (if applicable) will be completed and documented.

## Sales Ratio Review

Upon completion of assessment actions, sales ratio studies will be reviewed to determine if the statistics are within the guidelines set forth by the state.

## Notices

Change of value notices are sent to the property owner of record no later than June 1<sup>st</sup> of each year as required by §77-1315. Prior to notices being sent, an article will be published in the paper to keep taxpayers informed of the process.

## **Level of Value, Quality and Uniformity for assessment year 2013:**

<u>Property Class</u>	<u>Ratio (Level of Value)</u>
Residential	n/a
Commercial	n/a
Agricultural	69.00

For more information regarding statistical measures, see 2013 Reports & Opinions issued by the Property Assessment Division of the Department of Revenue, April 2013.

## **Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2014:**

**Residential:** A physical inspection of all residential properties in the towns of Ashby, Hyannis, Whitman was completed by the end of 2012. Value changes were reflected on the 2013 County Abstract. Statistical studies will be completed to determine if ratios are reflecting values with appropriate uniform and proportionate assessments. Appraisal maintenance and pick-up work will be completed as needed in addition to sales review.

**Commercial:** A Commercial Re-appraisal was completed in the fall of 2011 and implemented into the TerraScan program in January 2012. Appraisal maintenance and pick-up work will be completed as needed. Statistical studies will be completed to determine if ratios are reflecting values with appropriate uniform and proportionate assessment.

**Agricultural:** : A physical inspection of all ag-improved parcels within the county will be completed in 2013 by the assessor and/or contract appraiser to be implemented into the TerraScan program in January 2014. A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification group will be conducted to determine what adjustments, if any, need to be made to comply with statistical measures. Land usage will be tracked through shared information from the local NRD and FSA offices. Improved agricultural sales will be monitored through ratio studies.

### **Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2015:**

**Residential:** The assessor will continue to monitor and review the urban and suburban residential parcels within the county to determine if there are changes in the market that would require a change in assessment for an area, subclass or neighborhood. Statistical studies will be completed to determine if ratios are reflecting values with appropriate uniform and proportionate assessments. Appraisal maintenance and pick-up work will be completed in addition to sales review.

**Commercial:** The assessor will continue to monitor and review the commercial parcels within the county to determine if there are changes in the market that would require a change in assessment. Maintenance or pickup work will continue on commercial properties. Statistical studies will be completed to determine if ratios are reflecting values with appropriate uniform and proportionate assessments. Appraisal maintenance and pick-up work will be completed in addition to sales review.

**Agricultural:** A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification group will be conducted to determine what adjustments, if any, need to be made to comply with statistical measures. Land usage will be tracked through shared information from the local NRD and FSA offices. Improved agricultural sales will be monitored through ratio studies.

### **Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2016:**

**Residential:** The assessor will continue to monitor and review the urban and suburban residential parcels within the county to determine if there are changes in the market that would require a change in assessment for an area, subclass or neighborhood. Statistical studies will be completed to determine if ratios are reflecting values with appropriate uniform and proportionate assessments. Appraisal maintenance and pick-up work will be completed in addition to sales review.

**Commercial:** The assessor will continue to monitor and review the commercial parcels within the county to determine if there are changes in the market that would require a change in assessment. Maintenance or pickup work will continue on commercial properties. Statistical studies will be completed to determine if ratios are reflecting values with appropriate uniform and proportionate assessments. Appraisal maintenance and pick-up work will be completed in addition to sales review.

**Agricultural:** A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification group will be conducted to determine what adjustments, if any, need to be made to comply with statistical measures. Grant County has also implemented GIS and it is in use. Land usage will be tracked through shared information from the local NRD and FSA offices. Improved agricultural sales will be monitored through ratio studies. Appraisal maintenance and pick-up work will be completed in addition to sales review.

**Other functions performed by the assessor's office, but not limited to:**

Permissive Exemptions: Review annual filings of applications for new or continued exempt use and make recommendation to county board. This office receives approximately 18 applications annually.

Homestead Exemptions: Review annual filings of applications; process approvals and denials; send denial notifications to applicants no later than July 31; prepare and send applications to Department of Revenue no later than August 1 annually. This office receives approximately 35 applications annually.

Homestead Exemption Tax Loss Report: Compile tax loss due to Homestead Exemptions and report no later than November 30 annually.

Personal Property Schedules: Review annual filings of agricultural and commercial schedules. This office receives approximately 125 personal property schedules annually.

Form 45 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property and Assessed Value Update: Compile all real property valuation information and report no later than March 19 annually.

Board of Educational Land and Funds Report: Compile all valuations for properties owned by BELF and report no later than March 31 annually.

Change of Value Notification: Notification sent no later than June 1 annually to all property owners whose value changed from the prior year.

Form 45 County Abstract of Assessment for Personal Property: Compile all personal property valuation information and file by June 15 annually.

Tax List Corrections: Prepare tax list corrections documents for County Board of Equalization review.

Taxable Value and Growth Certifications: Total assessments for real, personal and centrally assessed properties are reported to all political subdivisions no later than August 20 annually.

School District Taxable Value Report: Final report of taxable value for all school districts located within the county to be filed no later than August 25 annually.

Annual Inventory Statement: Report of all personal property in possession of this office to be filed with the County Board by August 31 annually.

Average Residential Value Report: Certification of the average residential value for Homestead Exemption purposes filed no later than September 1 annually.

Three Year Plan of Assessment: Assessment plan detailing the next three years that must be prepared by June 15 annually, submitted to the County Board of Equalization no later than July 31 annually and filed no later than October 31 annually.

Tax List: Certification of the tax list, for both real and personal property within the county, which must be delivered to the treasurer no later than November 22 annually.

Certificate of Taxes Levied: Final report of the total taxes to be collected by the county to be filed no later than December 1 annually.

Government Owned Properties Report: Report of taxable and exempt state or governmental political subdivision owned properties to be filed for the year 2004 and every 4<sup>th</sup> year thereafter no later than December 1 annually.

**Conclusion:**

The Grant County Assessor makes every effort to comply with state statute and the rules and regulations of the Property Assessment Division of the Department of Revenue in an attempt to assure uniform and proportionate assessments of all properties in Grant County.

Considering the broad range of duties this office is responsible for, it is anticipated that there will always be a need for the services of a contract appraiser. However, it is a goal of this office to ultimately complete the majority of the appraisal work by the assessor and office staff as budgetary concerns exist.

Lastly, it is a high priority that this office makes every effort to promote good public relations and keep the public apprised of the assessment practices required by law.

Respectfully submitted,

Christee L. Haney  
Grant County Assessor

## 2014 Assessment Survey for Grant County

### A. Staffing and Funding Information

<b>1.</b>	<b>Deputy(ies) on staff:</b>
	0
<b>2.</b>	<b>Appraiser(s) on staff:</b>
	0
<b>3.</b>	<b>Other full-time employees:</b>
	0
<b>4.</b>	<b>Other part-time employees:</b>
	1
<b>5.</b>	<b>Number of shared employees:</b>
	1
<b>6.</b>	<b>Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:</b>
	\$ 74,910 - This budget includes all offices managed by the Ex Officio Assessor.
<b>7.</b>	<b>Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:</b>
	same
<b>8.</b>	<b>Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:</b>
	None in the Ex Officio budget but, \$ 20,250 is a line item in the General Fund.
<b>9.</b>	<b>If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:</b>
	Not applicable.
<b>10.</b>	<b>Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:</b>
	\$ 2,000.00
<b>11.</b>	<b>Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:</b>
	\$ 1,000.00
<b>12.</b>	<b>Other miscellaneous funds:</b>
	Not applicable, budget includes all functions of being ex officio.
<b>13.</b>	<b>Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:</b>
	Not applicable, budget includes all functions of being ex officio.

## B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

<b>1.</b>	<b>Administrative software:</b>
	TerraScan owned by Thomson Reuters
<b>2.</b>	<b>CAMA software:</b>
	TerraScan owned by Thomson Reuters
<b>3.</b>	<b>Are cadastral maps currently being used?</b>
	No
<b>4.</b>	<b>If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?</b>
	Not applicable.
<b>5.</b>	<b>Does the county have GIS software?</b>
	Yes – GIS Western Resources through the end of 2013, then will contract with GIS Workshop for 2014.
<b>6.</b>	<b>Is GIS available to the public? If so, what is the web address?</b>
	Not currently.
<b>7.</b>	<b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>
	GIS Western Resources, Inc. for the remainder of 2013 and then will switch to GIS Workshop.
<b>8.</b>	<b>Personal Property software:</b>
	TerraScan owned by Thomson Reuters

## C. Zoning Information

<b>1.</b>	<b>Does the county have zoning?</b>
	Yes
<b>2.</b>	<b>If so, is the zoning countywide?</b>
	No
<b>3.</b>	<b>What municipalities in the county are zoned?</b>
	The village of Hyannis is the only area not zoned.
<b>4.</b>	<b>When was zoning implemented?</b>
	2002

## D. Contracted Services

<b>1.</b>	<b>Appraisal Services:</b>
	Susan Lore - DBA Lore Appraisal Company
<b>2.</b>	<b>GIS Services:</b>
	GIS Western Resources but will go with GIS Workshop in 2014.
<b>3.</b>	<b>Other services:</b>
	TerraScan owned by Thomson Reuters

## E. Appraisal /Listing Services

<b>1.</b>	<b>Does the county employ outside help for appraisal or listing services?</b>
	Yes – Lore Appraisal Company
<b>2.</b>	<b>If so, is the appraisal or listing service performed under contract?</b>
	Yes
<b>3.</b>	<b>What appraisal certifications or qualifications does the County require?</b>
	Experience and knowledge of mass appraisal (listing and appraisal work), Marshall Swift costing, computer skills, and customer relation skills.
<b>4.</b>	<b>Have the existing contracts been approved by the PTA?</b>
	Yes – a copy was sent to the Property Tax Administrator.
<b>5.</b>	<b>Does the appraisal or listing service providers establish assessed values for the county?</b>
	The contracted appraiser will review all work with the assessor and may have some recommendations however, the final decisions on estimates of value will be made by the assessor.



# 2014 Certification for Grant County

---

This is to certify that the 2014 Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator have been sent to the following:

One copy by electronic transmission to the Tax Equalization and Review Commission.

One copy by electronic transmission to the Grant County Assessor.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2014.



A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ruth A. Sorensen".

---

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator



